

THE STATE OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RE: Design-Build Project
for Indian River Inlet Bridge
Replacement of Bridge 3-156,
SR1 over Indian River Inlet
State Contract #26-073-03 Readvertised
Federal Contract #BRN-S050(14)

November 14, 2007 at 1:30 p.m.

Pre-Qualification Meeting

A Pre-Qualification Meeting held on
Wednesday, November 14, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the
DelDOT Administration Center, 800 Bay Road, Dover,
Delaware, reported by Lorena J. Hartnett, a
Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public.

WILCOX & FETZER
1330 King Street - Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 655-0477
www.wilfet.com

1 MR. EUSTIS: Good afternoon, ladies and
2 gentlemen. A couple of housekeeping things before we
3 start. Many of you that have been in meetings of mine
4 will remember this. This is a cell phone. You have
5 two options. You can put it on vibrate or you can turn
6 it off.

7 The only people that get to keep their phone
8 on are those people whose wives are going to be in
9 labor soon or who have a close relative that's in
10 surgery, so let's get that taken care of right away.

11 If, indeed, you have to answer the telephone
12 for some important reason, please pick it up, leave the
13 room, and have the conversation outside. It's not fair
14 to distract the other people.

15 My name is John Eustis. I am contract
16 services project manager. I am here solely for the
17 purposes of acquiring a bridge over the Indian River
18 Inlet by design-build, and this project is 26-073-03
19 Re-advertised. That's for the transcriptionist's
20 purposes.

21 And before we get started in my spiel and
22 Doug's spiel, I would like to introduce Secretary
23 Carolann Wicks for a greeting.

24 SECRETARY WICKS: Thanks, John. I see

1 friendly faces. I don't have a spiel, but I did want
2 to say a few words. Certainly, this project is near
3 and dear to our hearts. We have certainly had some
4 trials and tribulations of this project, to say the
5 least, but that in no way should indicate that we do
6 not have a strong commitment to building this bridge.

7 You have probably seen some things in the
8 newspaper as far as some discussions on where we are
9 with the embankment and making some decisions on some
10 changes there, given the consolidation and settlement
11 that's been going on, or not going on to the degree
12 that we feel is necessary, and we are making decisions
13 on that and we will continue to do that and work with
14 staff in moving that forward.

15 The bottom line that I am communicating to all
16 of you is that the funding is in place, we have funding
17 available not only through our regular Capital Program,
18 but we have a significant amount of funds that have
19 been set up through the Federal Highway Administration,
20 thank you very much, on funding that's come through our
21 regular apportionment as well as special discretionary
22 money that's come from the hard work of our
23 Congressmen, so those monies cannot be used anywhere
24 else, they don't have a way to be segregated or

1 re-delegated or re anything. They have to go to this
2 project, and that's it, so it certainly gives, I think,
3 a lot of credence to the fact that funding is there and
4 we have the ability to move forward on that.

5 You have a great team of people at DelDOT to
6 work with. If you don't know them, hopefully you will
7 as you work through this project with us. We are here
8 to answer your questions. We are here to work as a
9 team, because that's the way it gets done in Delaware.
10 And so we have some great staff here. You will meet
11 some more today, if you haven't.

12 But I am here to encourage all of you to stay
13 in the game, work through this, and be part of the
14 process, and look forward to have good competition and
15 part of, ultimately, the selection for a fantastic new
16 bridge down at the Indian River Inlet Bridge.

17 We are anxious to get it done. There is
18 certainly a lot of excitement on getting this done by
19 the community. You will certainly see a lot of support
20 from the community and from the legislators in the area
21 to get it done, so it's not the kind of project that I
22 think will have the kind of controversy of, you know,
23 in that community of what's needed. The people there
24 certainly want it to be done and, quite frankly, would

1 like to have had it done yesterday, so we want to move
2 forward, we want to get it done, and we know that
3 there is a team out there that's best suited to help us
4 get the job done.

5 So welcome, welcome to Delaware, and thank you
6 all, and keep working with us to get your questions
7 answered and put together a hell of a package.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. EUSTIS: Okay, I have about 40 sheets of
10 paper here. I want to say a few notes, so there are a
11 couple of things that, as we start this meeting out,
12 that I want you to be aware of, and I am going to go
13 over some of the timing issues and a couple of other
14 things about the meeting, itself, before I let Doug
15 talk to you.

16 One of those is you can see this meeting is
17 being transcribed. How many of you know Lorena?
18 Didn't think so. When you have a question or a
19 comment, you must state your name and who you
20 represent. That's the only way she is going to know
21 who you are. The other thing is she can only type what
22 one person is saying at a time, so try not to -- I
23 don't want people talking over one another. First of
24 all, it's not necessary. Secondly, it makes it

1 impossible for us to get a decent transcript that way.

2 My preference as we go along, once I start
3 talking about something or Doug starts talking about
4 something, is, if you have a question, my preference is
5 to have you ask that question while you are thinking of
6 it. It may be something I am going to get to in a
7 second. It may be something that I have not thought
8 of, but I would rather have you ask your questions when
9 they are fresh in your mind. That's just my
10 preference. Doug may have a different preference. I
11 don't know.

12 Does everyone here have a copy of the RFQ or
13 has requested for the firm a copy of the RFQ? Okay, if
14 you have not yet done so and you have a need of that,
15 see me afterwards, give me your e-mail address, I will
16 e-mail that to you.

17 Now, about the RFQ, 2.2 is the procurement
18 schedule, and I am already ready with addenda number
19 one, because the final date for submitted questions is
20 on a Saturday and, frankly, I'm not coming in on a
21 Saturday to accept your questions, so that will be
22 changed from December 15 to December 13.

23 If you have comments about the RFQ or
24 questions about the RFQ, please e-mail me with those.

1 I would prefer e-mail. You can fax. You can e-mail.
2 I have some limited number of cards up here, about 50
3 of them, that have my e-mail address on there, but it's
4 the same as it's always been. It's john.eustis, that's
5 E-U-S-T-I-S, at state.de.us. You can call me at
6 302-760-2026. You can ask me your question then, and I
7 will tell you to put it in an e-mail and e-mail it to
8 me, because I want all the communications in writing.

9 Fax: My fax number is (302) 739-2254. You
10 can fax questions to me, I still will respond, but, as
11 I said, my preference is for e-mail because it makes it
12 easier for me to transfer those on to the actual people
13 that need to answer the questions.

14 I am your sole source of contact for this
15 project. Any e-mail that you send to Carolann, to
16 Doug, or to Dennis or anyone else in the organization
17 is just going to be sent to me. Save yourself some
18 trouble. Just send them directly to me.

19 If you speak to folks out in the field about
20 the project, they are not going to answer your
21 questions either. You still have to e-mail them to me
22 or speak to me. They know that, and if they act kind
23 of agitated when you come and ask them a question, it's
24 because you have been told to send your questions to

1 me. Alright? Pretty simple.

2 As Carolann, I would like to reiterate, as
3 Carolann said, we are going forward with this project.
4 We have no choice but to go forward with this project.
5 At the end of the day, what I want to see is I want to
6 see three proposals for three equally good bridges from
7 three equally good teams that we could select one or
8 the other and, you know, any one of the three, and we
9 will cooperate with you in that process.

10 If you have looked at the procurement
11 schedule, you will see that for the RFP we will be
12 doing interviews, or you will be doing presentations,
13 if you are one of the successful submitters, if you are
14 on the short list, for the concept.

15 When final technical proposals are due, we
16 will accept those proposals and we will, more than
17 likely, be scheduling presentations for the final
18 technical proposal. In the last go around we had
19 initial technical proposals where we did presentations.
20 We are not doing that this time. It was a great thing
21 to do. We learned a lot out of that, and I believe you
22 folks that did present learned a lot out of that also.
23 We are not going to do that this time. We are going to
24 boil it down to just two.

1 Okay, authority do this project: In the bond
2 bill this past legislative season there was specific
3 language authorizing this project to be done by the
4 Department, so if you have questions about that, see me
5 afterwards. I will direct you to the location where
6 those are in the RFQ. The chapter and verse of the
7 Delaware Code where the authority to do this project by
8 the legislature, signed by the governor is in the RFQ,
9 it will be repeated in the RFP, so there should be no
10 question in anyone's mind about whether the Department
11 has the authority to do this project.

12 Reasons for qualifications: We do, on large
13 projects like this, we are going to short list up to
14 three firms, and those three firms are going to have to
15 meet minimum criteria, very similar to what we had in
16 the past. There are pass/fail criteria, and then there
17 are technical and price scores.

18 The technical and price scores will be
19 weighted differently than they were in the past, but
20 the fact of the matter is what we are shooting for, I
21 am shooting for, and I hope that you are shooting for,
22 is high technical scores and to be within the budget
23 that we have set up.

24 I have been asked by several folks can we see

1 the designs from the previous selection. No, you
2 cannot. I made a guarantee to the people that
3 presented the last time that their designs were going
4 to be confidential until there was a contract award.
5 There was no award. Those designs are confidential, so
6 that's where I am in that process. We have authority
7 under the purchasing code to maintain that type of
8 confidentiality on previous proposals. So, if you want
9 to question that, there is no point in doing that
10 either. That is also the only fair way to deal with
11 the people that presented previously. It wouldn't be
12 fair to them if I was to let their designs go to other
13 firms for their own ideas, so.

14 A couple of things that are referred to in the
15 RFQ and in the -- well, mostly in the RFP -- are the
16 standard specifications for road and bridge
17 construction. They are on the website of DelDOT at
18 www.deldot.gov under publications. Hard copies are
19 available in my office right over here for a cost of
20 \$42.

21 The standard construction details are also
22 available on the web in PDF format. However, you may
23 want to go ahead and spend the \$29 to get them.
24 Supplemental specs to match the standard spec will be

1 included in the RFP, so you don't have to worry about
2 that, although they are on the website and you can take
3 a look at that.

4 Confidentiality: I think that I can pretty
5 well say that the folks that were involved in the last
6 design-build, I guaranteed them confidentiality of
7 their designs and all the information that was
8 submitted to me, and that confidentiality was
9 maintained. Any disagreement with that statement?
10 That is the case here.

11 The people that will be looking at your
12 designs and participating in the RFQ and the RFP
13 process will have signed confidentiality agreements.
14 They will not be permitted to discuss anything that
15 they see outside of those other folks that have signed
16 the confidentiality agreements, and only for the
17 purposes of evaluation.

18 They will not be permitted to talk about the
19 project or the details of the project or anything
20 that's submitted to anyone outside of those people
21 involved in the evaluation of the RFQ's, or the SOQ's
22 and the RFP's that you put in, the proposals that you
23 put in.

24 I have a pretty high standard for

1 confidentiality and, to be honest with you, some folks
2 were excluded from the last go-around, and I have had
3 no problem with anybody that has presented any
4 problems. All I have to do is hear one thing come back
5 to me around about any issue that was supposed to be
6 maintained confidential, and that person is out of the
7 process. I'm not kidding around with this. It is
8 important for you, it is important for us that that be
9 maintained.

10 I say that because, as you send your people
11 out to investigate the conditions of the job and people
12 that you speak to, other agencies, it might be a good
13 idea if you instruct them to maintain confidentiality
14 about what you are doing.

15 Obviously, you are going to have to talk to
16 suppliers and material men and subcontractors. You are
17 going to have to release information that way. If I
18 were you, I would suggest you engage in confidentiality
19 agreements with them also.

20 Okay, is that stern enough?

21 Alright, a couple other things that we have to
22 go over. As I said earlier, the last day for questions
23 on the RFQ is going to be December 13. That allows me
24 to get the responses out by the 17th, and the SOQ's are

1 due on the 19th of December.

2 The SOQ's are due in this building in the
3 bidder's room. Where you came by the receptionist,
4 when you come in the front door, there are stairs up to
5 the left hand side. That is the Bidder's Room. You do
6 not have to sign in to go into the Bidder's Room. It's
7 a public room. We have a window there where those
8 things will be accepted, so they are due at 2:00 p.m.
9 on December 19. And 2:00 p.m. and 10 seconds is too
10 late. We go by Verizon time here. We are on Verizon
11 time here. For those of you that have Cingular or AT&T
12 or any of those things, if you need to know what time
13 2:00 is, give me call. Okay?

14 Anybody that shows up late -- I hate turning
15 people down for a project that could be up to
16 \$150 million, so get it in early. If you are going to
17 have it delivered, make sure that the person who is
18 coming here knows where they are going. The address
19 here is 800 South Bay Road, Dover, Delaware, 19901. If
20 you just put in Bay Road on MapQuest, you wind up in
21 Kitts Hummock, and that's not too good, too far away.

22 I have some CD's of the draft RFP parts one
23 through five. They are not complete. They will be on
24 the website hopefully this week, but at least by next

1 week, but I have 15 copies of the CD's up here, and I
2 would like to offer those one copy of the CD per firm,
3 and I would like to know who is picking those up so
4 that I don't duplicate.

5 The SOQ forms, you have gotten them in PDF
6 format. I have them in Word format. If you want them
7 in Word format, let me know, and I will e-mail them to
8 you.

9 Okay, questions on the RFQ: Ask them at your
10 leisure. I may accumulate a few and respond to them
11 all at once. One of the things that you need to
12 understand is when you send questions to me and I have
13 to go elsewhere for answers to the questions, the
14 people that supply me with the answers don't know who
15 asked it. Only I do. And, when I respond, if it's a
16 question that is specific to your firm, it will be
17 specifically to you. If it is general in nature, it
18 will be to everyone, and it will be in the form of an
19 addendum to the RFQ, which I will e-mail out to all of
20 those people that have requested RFQ's.

21 We used that in the past. It seemed to work
22 pretty well. I didn't get any complaints about it, so,
23 if there are complaints about that process, you gotta
24 let me know.

1 There is one other very important thing I need
2 to say, and that is you are probably not interested in
3 hearing from me anymore, so I am going to turn this
4 over to Doug and let him speak to the project.

5 And, as I said, if you have questions for me,
6 get them to me. You can ask me questions after the
7 show here, and any other questions on the RFQ, RFP,
8 please e-mail them in.

9 The RFP, please look through that. Please
10 make comments. Please make suggestions. This is the
11 time do it. I will be accepting comments on the RFP up
12 until December 19. After that point, I will accept
13 them, but I might not be able to incorporate them.
14 Okay? Any questions for me other than sit down and be
15 quiet?

16 MR. ROBB: Can everyone hear me okay? Well,
17 good afternoon. (Computer mouse fell) There goes the
18 mouse.

19 Welcome to our third annual informational
20 meeting. (Laughter) Hopefully, this will be the last.
21 What I want to do is for those who aren't familiar with
22 the project, this has been ongoing for awhile. I want
23 to talk a little bit about what we are trying to
24 accomplish. I do see some new faces. You may or may

1 not be familiar with the details of the project, but
2 basically what I want to try to convey is some
3 information that will help you put your teams together
4 and ultimately, hopefully, get you shortlisted for the
5 project.

6 So, with that, I am going to walk through a
7 couple of different things. First, obviously, this is
8 for Indian River Inlet Bridge. If you missed all that
9 discussion earlier, this is probably the time to leave.

10 What we are looking to accomplish is basically
11 replacing our existing structure with a new bridge just
12 west of the existing bridge on SR-1 between Bethany
13 Beach and Dewey Beach, Delaware. As you can see, it's
14 right along the coastline. Pretty severe, harsh
15 weather conditions, a very corrosive environment that
16 will ultimately lead to some of the design constraints
17 that will be placed on the project.

18 Some of the things I just want to point out on
19 this aerial photo. And I apologize for not having a
20 more recent photo to show the status of some of the
21 work that's going on. But, if you can see the pointer,
22 this is looking south/north, since we are on the east
23 coast.

24 Some of the work that's going to be performed

1 includes major park improvements at Delaware Seashore
2 State Park. You can see some old parking lot and
3 campsites. It doesn't look like that now, but
4 eventually that will be restored and improved beyond
5 the preexisting conditions.

6 Out to the ocean side you can see the severe
7 beach erosion. One of the unique things at this site,
8 there is actually a sand replenishment system that our
9 State Department of Natural Resources operates in
10 conjunction with the Corps of Engineers to pump sand
11 from the south side of the inlet to the north side of
12 the inlet, and we have a utility under the existing
13 bridge accommodating that same bypass system.

14 Obviously, our new bridge is going to need to
15 have allowances for the same system. I will get to
16 that later.

17 Maybe you can see, hopefully, just to the west
18 electric transmission lines. For some of you who were
19 involved in the project before, our original plan was
20 to underground the transmission line. That plan, as of
21 today, is likely going to get scrapped, so more than
22 likely we are going to have to work around those
23 transmission lines for the construction of this
24 project.

1 And just in case anyone hasn't seen what I
2 think is a well-documented history of why we are doing
3 the project, I think this picture says it all. This is
4 basically a rendering of the conditions within the
5 Indian River Inlet, and basically the blue and the
6 purple in the picture is bad. The scour depths that we
7 are seeing in our existing bridge piers are in excess
8 of 100 feet in areas. As you can see, it's getting
9 very close to some of our existing pier foundations.

10 We are monitoring very closely, but this is
11 the purpose for this project. We want to avoid this
12 situation. We are going to build a new bridge with
13 piers outside of the water. And for anyone that hasn't
14 seen that, I just wanted to explain again the purpose
15 of the project.

16 So what I am going to do now is just kind of
17 go over the status report of where we stand today, some
18 of our goals for the project, and our scope schedule
19 and budget that we set up for the design-build portion
20 of the project.

21 Just to recap some of the history, the
22 original design for the overall project was completed
23 back in 2005. As part of the original design, we
24 established a new alignment just west of the existing

1 SR-1 alignment. Through that process we obtained
2 right-of-way, went through a permitting process,
3 utility coordination, established a good traffic
4 phasing for getting SR-1 out of the way of the
5 construction of the new alignment, as well as doing the
6 tie-ins at the end of the bridge construction. And
7 some of that work is what you may see now going on with
8 our current roadway contract.

9 We have already had extensive park
10 improvements. There will be a future park contract
11 later, as well, to even take that a step further. We
12 have been through a very detailed public involvement
13 process with four informational workshops and two
14 design charettes, and what we did the last time through
15 the design-build and we will do again this time is
16 provide those summaries of what came out of those
17 workshops to assist you eventually in, hopefully, the
18 development of your proposals.

19 Through that original design, we ultimately
20 ended up with the single rib cable-supported arch
21 structure that you have probably seen.

22 As I mentioned, there is multiple contracts.
23 The roadway contract is ongoing now. We are here today
24 for the bridge portion of the project. There will be a

1 future park contract. We have already put out an
2 advanced utility relocation contract. And then
3 there is also the demolition work that will eventually
4 be required at the completion of the bridge
5 construction.

6 As I mentioned, roadway work has been going on
7 for the past two years, and when the contract was
8 originally let, we had the bridge contract on the
9 street, as well. Unfortunately, at that time it became
10 very apparent that we weren't going to be able to award
11 the project within our budget, and in October of 2005
12 we were forced to cancel bids.

13 We proceeded from there with the
14 re-advertisement as a design-build contract last July,
15 and by February of this year we had been through the
16 procurement process and received price proposals, and
17 we did find that we were able to get proposals within
18 our budget at the time. Our budget for the original
19 scope work under the design-build was 130 million.

20 As John mentioned, we ran into some problems
21 with our authority or apparent lack of authority to
22 proceed with the design-build for this project, and
23 ultimately in April we were forced again not to award.

24 But since that time, as Carolann and John have

1 both indicated, the specific bond bill language for
2 this project has been adopted. John has it available
3 for you, if you are interested. And, in the meantime,
4 we have been trying to finalize our scope of work for
5 the design-build portion of the project.

6 Now, as Carolann had alluded to, over the past
7 several months we have been dealing with issues
8 associated with the roadway approach work and our
9 embankments, and just recently we have made the
10 decision that we are going to remove a large portion of
11 the embankment, and a major part of that decision was
12 in minimizing the risk to the design-build teams that
13 would be coming forward for the bridge project.

14 There was a lot of uncertainty where we were
15 going, what might happen. We entertained a lot of
16 different ideas, but in the end we felt that removing
17 the problem, lengthening the structure, and keeping the
18 bridge portion of the project clean, neat, well-defined
19 was in the best interests of everybody.

20 And that led to our re-advertisement on
21 October 29, which, of course, has brought us all here
22 today.

23 So, again, just to recap our project goals
24 moving forward for the design-build, we are in the

1 request for qualifications stage, and ultimately we
2 want to issue our notice to proceed by early summer
3 2008 and ultimately have the project complete and
4 bridge available to traffic by the end of the year
5 2011.

6 We want to have a maintainable, easily
7 inspectable, long-lasting structure. We're looking for
8 high quality esthetically pleasing structure.

9 Safe construction: This is going to be
10 a point of emphasis for the project. For those of you
11 who have been through the process and those of you who
12 are familiar with the site, we have a lot of people in
13 this area, especially during our summer seasons. The
14 park continues to be open. There is a lot of fishermen
15 in the area, a lot of tourists in the area, especially
16 during the summer months. We really have to be
17 cognizant of how we work around and accommodate the
18 public.

19 Along those same lines, we are looking for
20 something that is sensitive to the community, the
21 environment, and the park users.

22 And perhaps, most importantly, we are looking
23 for a project that's within or under our current
24 budget.

1 And assuming all goes well, we want to have
2 the opportunity to evaluate how the design-build
3 process has worked for this project.

4 So, with that, I want to turn to the
5 responsibilities that you, the design-builders, would
6 have and kind of highlight some of the different
7 components of the project and what they might mean to
8 you in your development of your teams.

9 It's going to be a design component obviously,
10 a design-build construction component, and there will
11 also be a quality control inspection component. The
12 design-build team will be responsible for the QC. The
13 Department will be performing quality assurance.

14 Some of the geometrics and materials related
15 to the design, some of the constraints that you can
16 expect, you will see these in the draft RFP. Again, we
17 are looking to maintain the horizontal and vertical
18 alignments that were originally established.

19 With the recent change of the approach
20 embankment, we will be looking to fully define the
21 horizontal alignment with the final RFP just so there
22 isn't any confusion.

23 The typical section that we have had
24 throughout will be applied again, same number of lanes,

1 shoulders. We are still going to have the pedestrian
2 walkway on the structure.

3 Our vertical under clearance over the inlet
4 will be maintained at 45 feet.

5 Our main span length over the inlet will be
6 maintained at 900 feet clear.

7 And this is probably the most substantial
8 change from both of the previous designs, and that's
9 the overall project length. The bridge is being
10 lengthened from what would have been about 1,400 feet
11 up to 2,600 feet. It's important to understand that
12 this is not to suggest that you need to provide a
13 three-span structure that's 2,600 feet long. I think
14 our expectation is that there will be some form of
15 approach spans approaching the primary, more complex
16 structure that's going to span the inlet.

17 The minimum clearance at the ends of the
18 bridge towards our abutments would be approximately 11,
19 or elevation 11 for the bottom chord, and it has to be
20 outside of the flood plane elevation.

21 We're going to be maintaining the existing and
22 proposed right-of-way from the original project. Given
23 the constraints, we really don't envision a need for an
24 additional right-of-way. That being said, if anything

1 were to -- If you have any ideas that might require
2 additional right-of-way that are good ideas, there are
3 mechanisms in the contract to allow for that.

4 And another criteria that's going to be held
5 is that we won't be allowing the use of structural
6 steel for exposed elements. There was a little
7 confusion on this criteria the last time through, so I
8 just want to bring that out right now in case that
9 affects what type of design consultant or construction
10 team you might be putting together.

11 Again, we are going to maintain flexibility in
12 the bridge type and/or style that's available to you.
13 We won't be dictating with the preliminary plan what
14 the structure needs to look like. We're primarily
15 going to be specifying clearance requirements.

16 Some of the other design issues: Utilities, I
17 mentioned the sand bypass system. There need to be
18 provisions on the bridge to accommodate the sand bypass
19 system. As it stands right now, you won't be expected
20 to install or design the system, just to have somewhere
21 that the load can be carried on the structure.

22 We will need to incorporate conduit, junction
23 boxes for DelDOT's ITMS system. There will be
24 mechanical and electrical system requirements

1 associated with your designs, so you should have the
2 appropriate expertise for those.

3 As I mentioned, we will have the electrical
4 transmission line remaining in place.

5 Permits: Permit requirements should be fairly
6 minimal from your standpoint. There will be Coast
7 Guard coordination requirements, FAA requirements based
8 on the structure type. We already have many permits in
9 hand for the project, and DelDOT will be responsible
10 for getting the extensions and any modifications on
11 those -- or I should say extensions only on those
12 permits.

13 If modifications are required based on your
14 design proposals, which we really don't anticipate,
15 but, again, if there is something that we are not
16 thinking about, that's available to you. You just have
17 to prepare the modifications for DelDOT to submit to
18 the agencies.

19 Another component of the project would be
20 public outreach, and this is going to be a primarily
21 informative approach, to make the public aware of what
22 you are proposing and why, help them understand the
23 concept and basically get the word out of what your
24 ultimate proposal is.

1 The solicitation of comments and incorporation
2 of those comments will be voluntary, but we do intend
3 to weight that in the scoring, so the more involvement
4 you have from the public in your final design details,
5 the more you will be rewarded in your technical
6 proposal scoring.

7 Just a highlight, design expertise
8 requirements: There will be hydraulic coastal
9 engineering and scour analysis required. Given the
10 coastal environment here, the coastal engineering
11 aspect is going to be very complex, and we do have a
12 specification with pretty detailed requirements with
13 the level of expertise that's going to be required for
14 that analysis, so I just want to highlight that.

15 The geotechnical engineering: Obviously, the
16 situation that has occurred with the approach
17 embankments, I think, probably says enough about the
18 difficulties that you need to deal with on the
19 geotechnical engineering.

20 Obviously, the structural and bridge
21 specialist, mechanical, electrical, concrete specialist
22 based on your type of design, maybe mass concrete
23 specialist might be appropriate, grouting specialist.
24 Again, what we will be looking for later is that you

1 have the appropriate for the design that you are
2 putting forward. Wind engineering and testing.
3 Environmental coordination, again, that hopefully would
4 be minor. And public outreach specialist.

5 From the construction side, basically what we
6 are going to be looking at here is to just make sure
7 that you have qualified people in the appropriate
8 positions on the construction team. We will be looking
9 for a construction manager, CPM scheduler on this
10 project. The CPM schedule will basically be cost
11 loaded, so it's important that we have a good schedule
12 and that we are tracking things accordingly so we can
13 handle appropriate payments.

14 Safety manager, and we talked about safety
15 before and the importance of it for this project, any
16 project.

17 Traffic control supervisor, that should again
18 be a fairly small role on this project. We are off
19 alignment for the bridge work. That being said,
20 bringing materials around the site or to the site, you
21 need to provide appropriate traffic controls.

22 Construction engineers and survey, pretty
23 standard. As-built drawings. And, again, based on the
24 type of design that you develop, we would want to see

1 the appropriate specialty on the personnel side,
2 as well.

3 I mentioned that quality control would be the
4 responsibility of the design-build team. One of the
5 things we are looking for is an independent QC firm on
6 the design-build team. And this is a little different
7 than the last time through, so I just want to highlight
8 that.

9 As part of that QC team, you would have an
10 overall QC manager, a design QC manager with the
11 appropriate support, and then a construction QC manager
12 with the appropriate support, and the design-build team
13 for that QC will be responsible for materials testing,
14 as well.

15 Just to highlight and avoid any confusion in
16 putting your teams together, we do have a group of
17 firms that are not eligible to pursue the project,
18 based on the fact that they assisted in the development
19 of our current design-build requirements. Since they
20 have been on our payroll once in developing this, we
21 can't put them on the payroll twice.

22 And, as you can see, we have Figg Bridge
23 Engineers, T.Y. Lin International, Wallace Montgomery
24 and Associates, Schnabel Engineering, West Wind

1 Laboratories, and Henry G. Russell. And they should
2 all be aware of this limitation, as well.

3 So, with that, I want to move on to the
4 schedule. John has already touched on a lot of the key
5 dates. Again, just to reiterate, December 19 is when
6 the statements of qualifications would be due. We're
7 intending to announce the short list by January 11,
8 with no more than three teams, then issue the request
9 for proposals end of January, January 30.

10 And, again, when we issue the final RFP to the
11 short list of teams, we will probably do that with the
12 pre-proposal meeting on site so you can see it, we can
13 talk about the existing conditions, and at that time,
14 which we are coming into January and we would expect
15 that some of the work associated with embankment
16 removal is ongoing at that time, so you can kind of get
17 a sense as to what things are going to look like by the
18 time the project would be or the site would be turned
19 over to the design-build team.

20 Concept plans would be due fairly soon after
21 that, the last week of February, and the purpose of
22 this -- This is a little bit different than what many
23 of you probably experienced before, but we felt it
24 worked very well last time with the procurement

1 process. We are not giving you a preliminary design.
2 We are not handing you span lengths, span arrangement,
3 so we want to make sure that in the very early stages
4 in developing your concept that you are not going down
5 the wrong path. If we've done a poor job in defining
6 the criteria, that's a good chance for us to identify
7 any shortcomings in the RFP, get you back on track, and
8 make sure everybody is putting their resources to the
9 best use in putting their final proposals together.

10 And that's not a real detailed development.
11 It's more of a type size location type submission and
12 execution.

13 And then after that we'll get back to work and
14 prepare your final technical proposals that would be
15 due April 10. And we allow a three-week period there
16 for preparation of the final cost proposals while we
17 are evaluating and scoring the technical proposals.

18 Can everyone in the back hear me okay? Great.

19 As I mentioned before, we are looking for
20 anticipated award by May, an NTP by early summer, and
21 substantial completion, which in this case means that
22 we can put traffic on the bridge. We are not just
23 going to suddenly be able to open it to all traffic.
24 We have some phasing that will need to take place with

1 the traffic tie-ins, so we want to get that first lane
2 open on the bridge by the end of 2011.

3 And the total contract duration, approximately
4 three and a half years as a maximum. And there will be
5 incentive again in the scoring to provide accelerated
6 delivery of the project, and that will be rewarded in
7 the technical proposal scoring.

8 Our budgetary goals: John had mentioned our
9 current budget is 150 million. This is based on what
10 we learned the last go-around and what we felt the
11 project was worth for that scope of work and the added
12 bridge length that we have added to the project.

13 Similar to our previous approach, the budget
14 will be used as a benchmark for the scoring of the
15 price proposals. That's spelled out more in detail in
16 the -- Is it in the RFQ or RFP?

17 MR. EUSTIS: RFP.

18 MR. ROBB: And we have increased the stipend
19 amount considerably from last time, up to \$600,000.

20 MR. EUSTIS: Would anybody like that lowered
21 back down to 270, because we can do that?

22 VOICE: Make the last one higher there.

23 MR. EUSTIS: That's not how it works, Bruce.

24 MR. ROBB: So, with that, we will do our best

1 to answer any questions, clear up any confusion or
2 issues that might be out there.

3 MR. EUSTIS: And, as I said before, with
4 questions and comments you will state your name and who
5 you represent, and we will do our best to answer those.
6 And, if we can't answer them here, we will answer them
7 by e-mail to all the proposal holders.

8 VOICE: I have got a question.

9 MR. EUSTIS: Dave, I just said --

10 (Laughter)

11 MR. MCGUIGAN: Dave McGuigan with George &
12 Lynch. Sorry, I don't listen very well. You have
13 added approach spans with the RFP, and there are
14 several Delaware companies that can do these approach
15 spans. Have you considered a separate parallel project
16 for the approach spans, even as design-build, so that
17 the work would be going to local Delaware companies?

18 MR. ROBB: Yeah, we did consider it, Dave.
19 The difficulty I guess in that is the primary structure
20 in this case, we feel, is really going to be the
21 driving factor with the majority of the cost of the
22 project, and we wanted -- What we did last time and
23 what we wanted to try to maintain this time is
24 providing the most flexibility in determining the most

1 cost-effective primary structure to ensure that we get
2 an overall cost effective solution for the project, and
3 if we start to define limits to the primary structure
4 and limit it, we may be excluding the possibility of
5 some added cost savings to the overall project. That's
6 really the basis behind grouping it together. John, I
7 don't know if you wanted to add anything to that or --

8 MR. EUSTIS: No, that's fine.

9 MR. CONRAD: Bruce Conrad, Kiewit. What's
10 going to be different this time about the scoring of
11 the final proposal?

12 MR. EUSTIS: The technical score and the price
13 score. The technical scores are going to have -- They
14 are very similar to what they were before. The price
15 scoring is going to be almost identical, except that
16 when we combine those scores they will have to be
17 weighted. The technical score will be weighted
18 70 percent -- or the technical score will be weighted
19 30 percent, and the price score would be weighted
20 70 percent.

21 VOICE: Can you repeat that? We can't hear
22 you back here.

23 MR. EUSTIS: I will use the microphone. As a
24 result of how the information came out of the bond

1 bill, the technical score and the price score, when
2 they are combined, will be weighted. The technical
3 score will be weighted at 30 percent, and the price
4 score will be weighted at 70 percent before they are
5 combined for a total score.

6 MR. JANEKA: I have a question. Ted Janeka of
7 Operating Engineers. Will the specifications require
8 that all employees on that project be bona fide
9 citizens or legal citizens of the United States, or are
10 we going to allow illegals to work on this project?

11 MR. EUSTIS: I am pretty sure that the
12 Department of Labor would not look kindly on illegal
13 aliens being employed on this project. That is a state
14 code issue, not anything that is necessary to be put
15 into the project verbatim.

16 There is a preference for Delaware labor in
17 the RFP. However, that preference is overridden by
18 federal code, which allows that any contractor can
19 bring folks in, they don't have to actually have a
20 preference for Delaware labor, but there is nothing
21 that we can do to require that employees be from any
22 specific location. Otherwise, we lose federal funding.

23 MR. JANEKA: I think you need to check that
24 code, because in the City of Baltimore there is an

1 ordinance that any contractor doing work for the City
2 of Baltimore has to hire Baltimore residents, so if
3 there is a federal code in Baltimore, it should be
4 enforced the same way in Delaware.

5 MR. EUSTIS: This is an opportunity for
6 questions and answers. It's not an opportunity for
7 debate. Any other questions? Yes, sir?

8 MR. HAWKES: Under the project description,
9 Section B, roadway approaches -- Wallace Hawkes from
10 URS. It says roadway approaches will be the
11 responsibility of the Department, to include
12 embankment, etcetera, etcetera, the design-build
13 project shall include appropriate provisions for
14 connecting the approach roadways to new bridge.

15 I assume that will be the approach slab and
16 wing wall.

17 But then you go on to Section 2.1.2, the
18 evaluation factors, and it says, similar to last time,
19 "Roadway design and construction concepts and how the
20 work impacts the existing approaches factors in the
21 evaluation," and that's kind of the same it was last
22 time when we were trying to work around something you
23 had already built.

24 This time you say you all are going to take

1 care of redoing the approaches and we have to just kind
2 of tie into it, so those two statements seem contrary.

3 MR. EUSTIS: You are absolutely correct, and
4 we will clean that up, but we will be responsible for
5 taking care of the remainder of the approaches.

6 MR. HAWKES: It won't be a factor, then?

7 MR. EUSTIS: Right.

8 MR. HAWKES: And one last question --

9 MR. EUSTIS: Although it wouldn't be a real
10 good idea to have a gap between the approaches and
11 bridge either.

12 MR. HAWKES: The last time we were dodging
13 around what you had already built and trying to shorten
14 the bridge and stuff like that.

15 MR. EUSTIS: Right.

16 MR. HAWKES: When you say no exposed steel,
17 what you mean is a concrete bridge like last time?

18 MR. EUSTIS: Yes, sir.

19 MR. BOYCE: Joey Boyce from Del-South. You
20 guys, I read on, I think it was on the computer, you
21 guys were going to start removing the approaches before
22 the end of 2007?

23 MR. EUSTIS: I think that's our hope.

24 MR. BOYCE: Okay, is that going to be iterated

1 with the complete project, or is it going to be a
2 separate part of it?

3 MR. EUSTIS: The removal of the approaches was
4 anticipated, removal of some portion of the approaches
5 was anticipated in the original roadway and approaches
6 contract, and there are provisions for that in that
7 contract.

8 MR. BOYCE: Okay, okay.

9 MR. EUSTIS: Any other questions? Well,
10 again, I don't know how many firms we have represented
11 here. Like I said, I have 15 copies of the draft RFP
12 up here. One copy per firm would be my preference. I
13 will try to have what I have completed so far on the
14 website by the end of the week, but I can't guarantee
15 it. I know it will be on there by the end of next
16 week.

17 So, if there are no further questions, I would
18 say we are adjourned. Thank you very much for
19 attending.

20
21
22
23
24

CERTIFICATE

I, Lorena J. Hartnett, a Notary Public and Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an accurate and complete transcription of the proceeding held at the time and place stated herein, and that the said proceeding was recorded by me and then reduced to typewriting under my direction, and constitutes a true record of the testimony given by said witnesses.

I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, or attorney of any of the parties or a relative or employee of either counsel, and that I am in no way interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office on this 18th day of November 2007.

Lorena J. Hartnett, R.P.R.

Reporter Certificate #134-RPR, Exp. 01-31-2008

**ERRATA - CORRECTIONS TO THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE INFORMATIONAL
MEETING FOR CONTRACT 26-073-03 READVERTISED ,
DESIGN-BUILD REPLACEMENT OF
BRIDGE 3-156 ON SR1 OVER INDIAN RIVER INLET
NOVEMBER 14, 2007, 1:30 P.M.**

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| Page 17, line 12 | - | Strike “under” and replace with “on” |
| Page 17, line 13 | - | Strike “Same” and replace with “sand” |
| Page 24, line 20 | - | Strike “plane” and replace with “plain” |
| Page 24, Line 23 | - | Strike “an” and replace with “any” |
| Page 25, Line 17 | - | Strike “need” and replace with “needs” |
| Page 27, Line 7 | - | Strike “a” and replace with “to” |
| Page 28, Line 1 | - | Insert “expertise” after “appropriate” |
| Page 31, Line 12 | - | Strike "execution" and replace with "presentation". |
| Page 31, line 13 | - | Strike “we'll” and replace with “you'll” |